

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to distinguish over the cited art, and claims 2-4 are amended to correct a grammatical error. No new matter is added by this Amendment. Support for the language added to claim 1 can be found throughout the specification, for example at page 2, lines 17-20 and Fig. 1.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Williams and Examiner Howell at the personal interview held August 30, 2006, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 4, 8, 9, 11, 13 and 15-20 contain allowable subject matter.

II. Double Patenting

Claims 1-20 were provisionally rejected under non-statutory obviousness-double type patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of co-pending Application No. 11/000,410 ("Application '410"). Applicants respectfully point out that a Terminal Disclaimer has been filed in co-pending Application '410. As such, Applicants submit that a Terminal Disclaimer is not necessary in the above application.

III. Specification Objection

The specification was objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the Patent Office alleges that there is a lack of antecedent basis for "locking mechanism." To expedite the present application, Applicants have amended the specification at appropriate locations to disclose a locking mechanism instead of a locking means.

As such, Applicants submit that the specification provides antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,765,839 ("Röhm"). This rejection respectfully traversed.

The Patent Office alleges that Röhm teaches or suggests a chuck having all of the features recited in the present claims, including the nut, the locking mechanism, the sleeve, and the interaction(s) between each of these features. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Patent Office's assertions.

Specifically, Applicants submit that Röhm does not teach or suggest that the nut has a locking mechanism fixed thereon which is intended to engage in the set of teeth of the body when the chuck is in the tightened position, and that the interior wall of the sleeve is in contact with the locking mechanism such that the sleeve collaborates with the nut via the locking mechanism, as recited in claim 1.

As discussed during the August 30, 2006 interview, Röhm teaches that the locking mechanism is fixed on an intermediate coupling sleeve 18, not on the tightening ring (allegedly corresponding to the recited nut). See column 4, lines 47-48 and Figures 4A and 4B of Röhm. Moreover, in contrast to the present claims, Röhm teaches that the setting sleeve 9 directly activates the intermediate coupling sleeve 18, instead of the tightening ring 8. See column 5, lines 22-24 of Röhm.

In contrast, the chuck recited in the present claims does not include such an intermediate coupling sleeve. Instead, the locking mechanism is fixed to the nut, and the

interior wall of the sleeve is in contact with the locking mechanism such that the sleeve collaborates with the nut via the locking mechanism.

As such, Applicants submit that Röhm does not teach or suggest a chuck having a nut having a locking mechanism fixed thereon which collaborates with the sleeve via the locking mechanism, as required in the present claims.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Röhm does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claims 1-3, 5-7, 10, 12 and 14. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Leana Levin

William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Leana Levin
Registration No. 51,939

WPB:LXL/can

Date: October 6, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--